



Internal Reviews

Performance Period October 2005-December 2005

Introduction

Twenty-two complexes conducted their Internal Reviews during the second quarter of fiscal year 2006 (October 2005-December 2005). Reviews conducted this quarter started the fourth year of implementing an internally driven system for examining the performance of local service systems in providing services and supports for students with special needs. This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the quarter.

Findings

Internal Reviews were conducted in the second quarter in 22 of the 41 complexes. This represents roughly half of the complexes that will conduct Internal Reviews this school year.

In the quarter, 96% of the complexes conducting Internal Reviews achieved the desired goal for acceptable system performance. The goal is to achieve a rating of acceptable System Performance for 85% of students reviewed. Overall child status was acceptable for 94% of the students that were reviewed. All twenty-two complexes met the performance goal for child status. One complex, Konawaena, did not meet the performance target. System performance for the Konawaena Complex was acceptable for 77% of the youth reviewed, which was short of meeting the goal of 85%. Two of the cases found to have unacceptable system performance were at the high school receiving care coordination from the Family Guidance Center, and one was at the elementary level receiving services through School Based Behavioral Health. The complex did meet the performance target for child status with 92% of cases reviewed found to have acceptable child status. A corrective action plan with targeted strategies for improving areas of concern identified in the review has been developed by the complex team

Below are the Statewide results for all Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter (October 2005-December 2005):

STATE TOTAL
n=324

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=299)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 4% (n=12)	96% (n=311)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 2% (n=5)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 2% (n=8)	

94%

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Second Quarter, Fiscal Year 2006)

Child Status and System Performance results for each complex reviewed in the second quarter (October 2005-December 2005) Internal Reviews are displayed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance (Second Quarter, FY 2006)

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2005-2006	System Performance SY 2005-2006
Kohala	October 10-13, 2005	13	92%	100%
Kahuku	October 11-14, 2005	13	92%	92%
Kapa'a (East Kauai)	October 17-21, 2005	13	100%	100%
Pearl City	October 17-21, 2005	18	100%	100%
Konawaena	October 24-28, 2005	13	92%	77%
Waiialua	October 24-28, 2005	12	92%	92%
Farrington	October 24-November 4, 2005	19	89%	100%
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	November 7-10, 2005	16	94%	100%
Molokai	November 7-10, 2005	13	92%	92%
Kaiser	November 14-18, 2005	13	100%	100%
Radford	November 14-18, 2005	19	90%	95%
Waianae	November 14-18, 2005	21	90%	95%
Central Kauai	November 15-18, 2005	12	100%	92%
Lanai	November 28-December 2, 2005	13	100%	100%
Leilehua	November 28-December 2, 2005	20	90%	95%
Pahoa	November 28-December 2, 2005	12	100%	92%
Aiea	December 5-9, 2005	13	92%	100%
Kalaheo	December 5-9, 2005	14	100%	100%
Nanakuli	December 5-9, 2005	13	92%	100%
Roosevelt	December 5-9, 2005	15	87%	87%
King Kekaulike	December 12-16, 2005	16	88%	100%
Waiakea	December 12-16, 2005	13	100%	100%

Description of the Samples

There were a total of 324 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 3 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention.

Table 3. Distribution of the Sample (Second Quarter, FY 2006)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Kohala	4	4	4	1	13
Kahuku	4	3	5	1	13
Kapa'a (East Kauai)	5	3	4	1	13
Pearl City	5	3	9	1	18
Konawaena	4	3	5	1	13
Waialua	3	3	6	0	12
Farrington	5	4	9	1	19
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	6	2	7	1	16
Molokai	5	3	4	1	13
Kaiser	4	3	5	1	13
Radford	3	3	12	1	19
Waianae	8	4	8	1	21
Central Kauai	5	3	4	0	12
Lanai	5	3	4	1	13
Leilehua	5	5	9	1	20
Pahoa	4	3	5	0	12
Aiea	4	3	5	1	13
Kalaheo	4	4	5	1	14
Nanakuli	4	3	5	1	13
Roosevelt	5	3	6	1	15
King Kekaulike	6	3	6	1	16
Waiakea	4	4	4	1	13
Total	102	72	131	19	324

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 4. Sampling guidelines call for samples to be based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed in the second quarter (N=324), 17% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Overall, approximately 54% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are receiving case management services by the schools, 23% are IDEA non-Felix students, and 6% were receiving Early Intervention Services. No children were reviewed from Early Intervention in the Waialua, Central Kauai, or Pahoa Complexes.

This distribution does not meet the requirements for sampling distribution set by the State for all complexes. However, the State did adhere to the established process for establishing the sample where every effort was made to include the original youths picked through a random sampling process. In a number of complexes, the selected youth fell off the sample due to having moved out of the complex, or having siblings in the sample, or there were too few CAMHD or Early Intervention youths in the complex.

Table 4. Description of the Sample (Second Quarter, FY 2006)

	CAMHD	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA/ Non-SBBH	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Kohala	3	5	4	1	13
Kahuku	3	6	3	1	13
Kapa'a (East Kauai)	3	6	3	1	13
Pearl City	2	10	5	1	18
Konawaena	4	7	1	1	13
Waialua	2	8	2	0	12
Farrington	4	10	4	1	19
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	3	10	2	1	16
Molokai	1	6	5	1	13
Kaiser	2	6	4	1	13
Radford	3	11	4	1	19
Waianae	5	10	5	1	21
Central Kauai	3	7	2	0	12
Lanai	0	9	3	1	13
Leilehua	4	10	5	1	20
Pahoa	2	8	2	0	12
Aiea	1	8	3	1	13
Kalaheo	2	9	2	1	14
Nanakuli	3	6	3	1	13
Roosevelt	2	9	3	1	15
King Kekaulike	3	9	3	1	16
Waiakea	1	6	5	1	13
Total	56	176	73	19	324

Table 5 displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 324 youth reviewed represented the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentage of youth was in the category of Emotional Disturbance (23%). Specific Learning Disability (19%) and Other Health Impairments (14%) were the next most frequent.

Table 5. Disability Categories (Second Quarter, FY 2006)

	Kohala	Kahuku	Kapa'a (East Kauai)	Pearl City	Konawaena	Waialua	Farrington	Hilo/Laupahoehoe	Molokai	Kaiser	Radford	Waianae	Central Kauai	Lanai	Leilehua	Pahoa	Aiea	Kalaheo	Nanakuli	Roosevelt	King Kekaulike	Waiakea	Total
Autism	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	22
Deaf/Blindness																							0
Deafness				1																			1
Developmental Delay	1		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1			2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	23
Emotional Disturbance	3	2	4	4	4	2	7	5		2	5	7		1	7	3	3	2	5	4	3	2	75
Hearing Impairment			1										1										2
Mental Retardation		1				1	3	1		1	1	4	1		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	22
Multiple Disabilities		1		2			1			1	1	1				1		1				2	11
Orthopedic Impairment		1													1								2
Other Health Impairments	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	5	2	5	2	2	5	1	1				4	3	2	46
Specific Learning Disability	4	2	1	4	2	4	2	4	4	3	1	3	2	4	4	2	4	5	2	2	3		62
Speech/Language Impairment		1	1			1					1	1											5
Traumatic Brain Injury								1							1	1					1		4
Visual Impairment									1		1		1		1								4
504 Felix	2	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	26
IDEA, Early Intervention	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	19
2nd Quarter	13	13	13	18	13	12	19	16	13	13	19	21	12	13	20	12	13	14	13	15	16	13	324

Participants

A total of 380 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and University of Hawaii (UH) personnel, and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. The participants represented 30 different role groups. The largest group represented was Special Education Teachers (67), followed by Resource Teachers (48), DOE Contracted Mentors and Early Intervention Personnel (39), School Counselors (29), and Student Services Coordinators (25). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participate in multiple complex reviews.

Table 6. Internal Review Participants (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

	Kohala	Kahuku	Kapa'a (East Kauai)	Pearl City	Konawaena	Waialua	Farrington	Hilo/ Laupahoehoe	Molokai	Kaiser	Radford	Waianae	Central Kauai	Lanai	Leilehua	Pahoa	Aiea	Kalaheo	Nanakuli	Roosevelt	King Kekaulike	Waiakea	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	1			8	2	5		2	2	4				1		2	2						29
Educational Assistant					3									1									4
Principal								1	1					1									3
Vice Principal			1		1	1		1					3							2		2	11
Psychological Examiner						1																	1
DOE Contracted Mentors	3	3	1	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1		4	2	2	2		1	2	2	39
DOE Contracted: Others													1				1						2
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	3	3	3	4	2	2	4	3	1		2	2	2	3		3		1	2	3	3	2	48
SBBH Therapist, Manager					1	2										1						1	5
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)		1							1									1					3
Special Education Department Chair			1	2	1								1										5
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	1			10	2	1				10			1	6		12	8			16			67
Speech Language Pathologist																							0
Student Services Coordinator	3			4	5			6	3													4	25
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition, GT)				3		1				9						3	3			5			24
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)																				1			1
School Assessment Liaison, SAC																							0
Librarian, Reading Specialist			1							1													2
Autism Consultant			1																				1
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator		1		1			1		2			1		1					2	1		1	11
Social Worker			1						1														2
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member	1	1		1		1						1			1				1				7
Branch Chief, Clinical Director, Mokihana Director		1								1													2
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor				1							2	1					1						5
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH	1	1	1						1				1	1				1					7
Family Support Worker, FGC			3										4										7
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	2	1		1	2	2		2	2		1				1	1	2			4		2	23
Mental Health Supervisor	1		1		1	1							1					1				1	7
Public Health Nurse																							0
Early Intervention Personnel	2	2	2	3	2		2	2	1	2	2	2		2	3		2	2	2	2	2	2	39
2nd Quarter Total Participants	18	14	16	40	24	18	8	20	17	29	9	8	15	16	9	24	21	8	7	35	7	17	380

Review Outcomes and Trends

Statewide Child Status and System Performance Findings

As previously discussed, 96%, or 21 of the 22 complexes reviewed in the quarter performed acceptably well in performance of their local service systems. The complexes generally did well across measures of child status. In six complexes, the indicators for responsible behavior and stability were a concern for a number of the youths reviewed, which is a slight improvement over last year's reviews, but needs continued attention in those complexes. The lack of acceptable performance in this indicator means that a number of youth are not receiving services in school or in-home settings that are free from risk of disruption, or that youths are not learning the skills and behaviors that will allow them to be successful. Responsibility, stability and consistency of settings are important factors in youths achieving a sense of identity, security, attachments and optimal social development.

Most of the complexes also performed well across the indicators of current system performance. Long-term views, contingency plans, urgent responses, and finding what works to impact students' academic achievement were identified as areas needing improvement in a number of complexes. Each complex with identified performance issues in these areas have developed targeted improvement strategies that are under review by the State offices.

Konawaena Performance Findings

As discussed previously, Konawaena was the only complex during the reporting quarter that did not meet the performance threshold of 85% acceptable system performance. Of the 12 youths reviewed in the complex, one received care coordination from Early Intervention, four from the FGC, six through SBBH and one was IDEA only. System performance for these youths, as seen in Table 7, shows that three of the twelve had unacceptable results. Of note is that all three were deemed to have acceptable child status, although learning progress and safety were an issue for two of the three. Core system issues revolved around inadequate identification and address of focal concerns, lack of a long-term guiding view by the service teams, untimely implementation of services, and unsuccessful transitions. Two of the youths with unacceptable performance by their service teams were receiving care coordination through the Family Guidance Center, and one through SBBH.

Table 7. System Performance Results by Agency Involvement (Second Quarter, FY 2006)

Complex		Early Intervention	FGC Care Coordinated	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA
Konawaena	Acceptable	1	2	6	1
	Unacceptable	0	2	1	0

Overall for the entire sample of youths reviewed, child well-being was fairly good, with 92% having acceptable child status. The service system was more of a concern with 77% of the youths having acceptable service team performance. A closer look at the indicators of concern show that there were strengths in a number of areas, and need for improvement in a number of others.

Indicators of concern and the corresponding percentage of acceptable performance were:

- 1) Identification of students' focal concerns (54%)
- 2) Addressing focal concerns (77%)
- 3) Having a long-term guiding view (62%)
- 4) Unity of effort across agencies (69%)
- 5) Contingency plans for safety and health (67%)
- 6) Overall planning services (69%)
- 7) Timely implementation of services (69%)
- 8) Coordination of services (77%)
- 9) Urgent response (67%)
- 10) Risk reduction (79%),
- 11) Successful transitions (62%)
- 12) Problem solving by teams (69%)

The Konawaena complex would benefit from stronger team practices for strengthening the quality of individualized plans and their implementation across the dimensions cited above. These functions should occur minimally at the supervisory and peer review levels. Because there were serious child status concerns for at least one of the students in the sample, and unacceptable system performance for 23%, strengthened training and assurances for monitoring of the key service system functions for each student is needed. Technical assistance for the FGC and the complex to improve team practices is recommended.

The Konawaena Complex has developed an action plan that targets a number of strategies designed to enhance communications and cross-training between the Department of Education and the FGC. Careful monitoring of the implementation of activities, and more focused review of the system findings in the Internal Review by the Complex Quality Assurance Committee is strongly recommended.

Adequacy of Internal Review Reports

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review findings and data. The overall goal is to imbed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty-five school days following the conclusion of the Internal Review unless a specific waiver is granted, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty working days. No feedback to Internal Review reports is overdue at this time.

Summary

Based on the scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter, the state continues to demonstrate that the vast majority of youths with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. System performance has been acceptable for 96% of the 324 students that have been reviewed this school year through the second quarter. A full 94% were found to have acceptable child status. At least one complex, Konawaena, will need focused technical assistance to assure that services are able to impact success for all students.

Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the second quarter of fiscal year 2006 (October 2005-December 2005). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients: 1) in out of state treatment settings, 2) in out of home treatment, 3) with service delivery gaps, 4) with complaints, and 5) who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the 6) sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and 7) the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. 8) Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include 1) number of service gaps, 2) percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, 3) number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, 4) number of hearing requests, and 5) percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data on 6) suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

Kohala October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	9	0%
Out of Home	1	9	11%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	9	0%
Complaints	0	9	0%
CSP Timelines	5	9	56%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
0.7	0.5	71%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	6	0	0	0	89.5

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	757	1	151	4	.13	2.66

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kahuku October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	92% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	22	0%
Out of Home	3	22	14%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	22	0%
Complaints	0	22	0%
CSP Timelines	15	22	68%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	1	50%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	10	0	0	2	81.5

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	8382	83	1133	44	.99	3.88

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kapa'a (East Kauai) October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	40	0%
Out of Home	16	40	40%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	40	0%
Complaints	0	40	0%
CSP Timelines	20	20	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4	4	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	10	0	0	0	97

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2902	76	349	45	2.62	12.89

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Pearl City October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=18

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=18)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=18)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=18)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	4	16	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	16	6%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP Timelines	16	16	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	14	0	0	4	86.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	6145	92	685	37	1.5	5.4

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Konawaena October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 69% (n=9)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	77% (n=10)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 23% (n=3)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**92%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	38	0%
Out of Home	15	38	39%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	38	0%
Complaints	0	38	0%
CSP Timelines	32	38	84%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	12	0	0	1	92.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2068	97	283	42	4.69	14.84

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Waialua October 2005

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	92% (n=11)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	

92%
(n=11)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	7	0%
Out of Home	0	7	0%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	7	0%
Complaints	0	7	0%
CSP Timelines	7	7	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	4	0	0	1	88.6

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	1215	14	200	5	1.15	2.5

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Farrington October-November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=19

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 89% (n=17)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 11% (n=2)	100% (n=19)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

89%
(n=17)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	30	0%
Out of Home	9	30	30%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	30	0%
Complaints	0	30	0%
CSP Timelines	25	30	83%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4	4	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	22	0	2	1	88.2

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	7467	136	707	43	1.82	6.08

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Hilo/Laupahoehoe November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=16

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 94% (n=15)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 6% (n=1)	100% (n=16)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

94%
(n=15)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	2	86	2%
Out of Home	20	86	23%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	86	0%
Complaints	0	86	0%
CSP Timelines	73	86	85%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
5	4.3	86%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	45	0	1	1	88

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	4029	86	673	65	2.19	19.05

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Molokai November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	92% (n=12)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	6	0%
Out of Home	2	6	33%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	6	0%
Complaints	0	6	0%
CSP Timelines	6	6	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	8	1	0	0	100

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	798	32	164	12	4.01	7.32

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kaiser November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	10	0%
Out of Home	1	10	10%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	10	0%
Complaints	0	10	0%
CSP Timelines	10	10	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	14	0	2	6	100

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2963	34	271	9	1.15	3.32

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Radford November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=19

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 90% (n=17)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 5% (n=1)	95% (n=18)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 5% (n=1)	

90%
(n=17)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	17	0%
Out of Home	1	17	6%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	17	0%
Complaints	0	17	0%
CSP Timelines	17	17	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	61	0	0	0	95

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	6093	79	617	27	1.3	4.38

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Waianae November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=21

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 90% (n=19)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 5% (n=1)	95% (n=20)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 5% (n=1)	

90%
(n=19)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	50	0%
Out of Home	14	50	28%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	50	2%
Complaints	0	50	0%
CSP Timelines	50	50	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	26	0	1	5	89.1

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	5578	163	1002	78	2.93	7.78

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Central Kauai November 2005

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	92% (n=11)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	35	0%
Out of Home	7	35	20%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	35	0%
Complaints	0	35	0%
CSP Timelines	18	21	86%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	19	0	0	0	83.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3573	32	352	20	.90	5.68

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Lanai November-December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	1	0%
Out of Home	1	1	100%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	1	0%
Complaints	0	1	0%
CSP Timelines	1	1	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
0.5	0.5	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	8	0	0	0	90.9

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	484	16	132	13	3.31	9.85

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Leilehua November-December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=20

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 90% (n=18)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 5% (n=1)	95% (n=19)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 5% (n=1)	

90%
(n=18)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	67	0%
Out of Home	3	67	4%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	67	0%
Complaints	0	67	0%
CSP Timelines	67	67	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	77	0	2	0	88.3

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	6265	180	879	73	2.88	8.31

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Pahoa November-December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=12

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=11)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	92% (n=11)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 8% (n=1)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	35	0%
Out of Home	22	35	63%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	35	0%
Complaints	0	35	0%
CSP Timelines	23	35	66%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	1.7	85%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	7	1	0	0	87

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	1636	135	289	68	8.26	23.53

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Aiea December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

92%
(n=12)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	8	0%
Out of Home	0	8	0%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	8	0%
Complaints	0	8	0%
CSP Timelines	7	8	88%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	26	0	1	2	93

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	4134	16	399	11	.39	2.75

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Kalaheo December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=14

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=14)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=14)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=14)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	19	0%
Out of Home	4	19	21%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	19	0%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP Timelines	14	16	88%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	42	0	0	2	86.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3970	163	533	84	2.45	8.49

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Nanakuli December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 92% (n=12)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 8% (n=1)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**92%
(n=12)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	34	0%
Out of Home	10	34	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	34	0%
Complaints	0	34	0%
CSP Timelines	34	34	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	28	0	0	1	87.2

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	2661	217	428	75	8.16	17.50

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Roosevelt December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=15

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 87% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	87% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 13% (n=2)	

87%
(n=13)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	19	0%
Out of Home	0	19	0%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	19	0%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP Timelines	19	19	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
5	5	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	37	0	1	3	94.4

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	6553	63	580	23	.97	3.96

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

King Kekaulike December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=16

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 88% (n=14)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 12% (n=2)	100% (n=16)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

88%
(n=14)

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	32	0%
Out of Home	9	32	28%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	32	0%
Complaints	1	32	3%
CSP Timelines	26	32	81%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
4	35	0	1	15	92.1

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3686	22	628	15	.59	2.39

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

Waiakea December 2005

Internal Review Results

n=13

Test Outcome 1: + Child + System Performance 100% (n=13)	Test Outcome 2: - Child + System Performance 0% (n=0)	100% (n=13)
Test Outcome 3: + Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	Test Outcome 4: - Child - System Performance 0% (n=0)	

**100%
(n=13)**

Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	34	0%
Out of Home	6	34	18%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	34	0%
Complaints	0	34	0%
CSP Timelines	18	34	53%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	1.7	85%

School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	23	0	0	2	92.7

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
Totals	3771	162	484	66	4.3	13.64

* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education